Applicant : Gilbert Wolrich et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-312US1 / P9633US
Serial No. : 10/070,011
Filed   : July 3, 2002
Page   : 6 of 7

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1 and 30 are independent claims.

The examiner uses Agarwal to reject claims 1-23, 26 and 30-36 as having been anticipated.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "issue a memory reference to an address in a memory shared among threads executing in the microengines while a context of a thread is inactive." Agarwal neither describes nor suggests at least this quoted claim feature. No such feature is dislosed in Agarwal's memory instructions as found on page 109, paragraph 2. Agarwal merely discloses executing instructions from a given thread until it performs a remote memory request or fails in a synchronization request. (see page 104, paragraph 4). Agarwal includes an ALEWIFE cache-coherent machine with distributed, globally shared memory. (see page 105, paragraph 3). An instruction to issue a memory reference to an address in a memory shared among threads executing in the microengines while a context of a thread is inactive is totally absent in Agarwal. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Agarwal.

Claim 30 recites "inactivating the context of the thread issuing the command while the command is executing." Agarwal neither describes nor suggests at least this quoted claims feature. Inactivation is totally absent from Agarwal. Accordingly, claim 30 is not anticipated by Agarwal.

The examiner uses Agarwal in combination with official notice to reject claims 24, 25 and 27-29 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Agarwal in combination with official notice. Claims 24, 25 and 27-29 depend upon, and further limit, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 24, 25 and 27-29 are not rendered obvious by Agarwal in combination with official notice.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

Applicant : Gilbert Wolrich et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-312US1 / P9633US
Serial No. : 10/070,011
Filed   : July 3, 2002
Page   : 7 of 7

an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _September 30, 2004_

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20948621.doc